

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Addressing first the objection to the drawings noted in paragraph 2 of the Office Action, replacement Figures 2 and 4 are submitted herewith to address that objection.

Addressing the objection to the specification noted in paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the specification has been amended to correct the noted informalities. The specification has also been amended to correct other minor grammatical and idiomatic informalities.

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application. Claims 13 and 14 are added by the present response. Claims 1-9, 11, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,995,966 to Kii et al. (herein “Kii”) in view of U.S. patent 5,530,232 to Taylor. Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kii in view of Taylor and further in view of U.S. patent 6,498,987 to Kelly et al. (herein “Kelly”).

Addressing the above-noted rejections of claims 1-9, 11, and 12 as unpatentable over Kii in view of Taylor, and the further rejection of claim 10 in further view of Kelly, those rejections are traversed by the present response.

It is initially noted that each of the independent claims is amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein. Specifically, independent Claim 1 now recites “a printer which prints the message created by said message creator visibly and erasably on a card possessed by the at least one member” (emphasis added). The other independent claims 11 and 12 are similarly amended. Such features are believed to clearly distinguish over the applied art.

As noted in the specification, see for example page 7, line 25, to page 8, line 3, page 10, lines 22-25, and Figures 7B, 7C, 8A, and 8B, according to a feature in the claims as

currently written a visible message is printed on a surface of a card. That message is also erasable, i.e. a current message can be erased and a new message can be then written.

The above-noted features of physically printing a visible and erasable message on a card are believed to clearly distinguish over the applied art.

Kii discloses creating a sentence corresponding to an attribute of a user and displaying the sentence on a client terminal operated by the user, see for example Figures 3 and 4 and the descriptions thereof. As such Kii clearly does not teach or suggest any operation of printing onto a card a visible and erasable message.

Moreover, no teachings in Taylor can overcome the above-noted deficiencies in Kii.

Taylor discloses a system for gathering information recorded on a plurality of cards to place on one card. Taylor discloses that a card reader can update various records written on a card, see for example column 4, lines 19-22. However, as noted for example in Figure 1 in Taylor, the various records written onto the card 10 are stored in circuitry 12, i.e. stored in an electronic memory. Taylor, however, also does not teach or suggest printing *visible and erasable* images onto a card.

Moreover, Taylor discloses at column 4, lines 20-22, that in the case of a magnetic-stripe card updating of the records is performed at a remote location. That disclosure in Taylor further evidences that the writing performed by the card reader in Taylor stores data in a memory, and does not print a visible and erasable message on a card.

Taylor does disclose at column 4, lines 1-5, that the name of a card holder and possibly other information such as the social security number and telephone number may be printed on the face of a card. However, that information in Taylor is not designed to be erased.

In contrast to Taylor, in the claims as currently written the message printed onto one face of a card is both visible and erasable. That results because one of the objectives of the

currently claimed invention is to have a card in which message information can be updated as needed. Such a feature is neither taught nor suggested nor possible in the device of Taylor.

In such ways, no teachings in Taylor can overcome the deficiencies of Kii with respect to independent claims 1, 11, and 12 as currently written, and the claims dependent therefrom. Thus, each of claims 1-12 is believed to clearly distinguish over the combination of teachings of Kii in view of Taylor.

Applicants also note that with respect to dependent claim 9, that claim further recites that “a drawing and/or illustration representing contents of the message on the card” are printed “together with the message”. That feature even further distinguishes over the applied art as Kii does not disclose or suggest that a drawing and/or illustration can be printed onto a card.

Moreover, with respect to dependent claim 10, no teachings in Kelly can overcome the above-noted deficiencies of Kii in view of Taylor.

The present response also sets forth new dependent claims 13 and 14 for examination, which are believed to even further distinguished over the applied art.

New dependent claim 13 further recites “wherein said printer erases the message on the card by heat and prints a new message on the card by heat”. That subject matter is discussed in the present specification at page 9, line 25, to page 8, line 3, and at page 10, lines 22-25. Such a feature even further distinguishes over the applied art for reasons such as noted above.

New dependent claim 14 further recites “a determiner configured to determine whether or not the word/phrase table necessary for creating the message is stored in said memory” and “wherein said table creator creates the word/phrase table in a case in which said determiner determines that the necessary word/phrase table is not stored in said memory”. That subject matter is noted in the present specification at page 16, lines 5-19, as

an example. To determine whether or not a necessary word/phrase table is stored and to create a word/phrase table when it is determined that the necessary word/phrase table is not stored is further neither taught nor suggested by the applied art, and thus new dependent claim 14 even further distinguishes over the applied art.

In such ways, each of the pending claims is believed to clearly recite features neither taught nor suggested by the applied art.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
I:\ATTY\SNS\22's\220140\220140US-AM.doc

Two handwritten signatures are placed above a horizontal line. The signature on the left appears to be "Gregory J. Maier" and the signature on the right appears to be "Surinder Sachar".

---

Gregory J. Maier  
Registration No. 25,599  
Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423  
Attorneys of Record